Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20-23 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 7, 8, 14 and 16 being the independent claims. Claims 1 are 6 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10, 14, 16-18, 20 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,192,340 to Abecassis ("Abecassis") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,996,015 to Day et al. ("Day"), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,785,244 to Roy ("Roy"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Examiner admits that "Abecassis does not explicitly indicate selecting specific clips accomplished by user interaction with a menu generated by the server and that the menu interaction and the multimedia device is authenticated prior to granting access to said plurality of multimedia clips." *See* present Office Action, page 3. However, the Examiner contends that "Roy teaches a system with a client and server where the client receives multimedia content and clips from the server (Column 2, lines 25-36) where the server authenticates the user's request for multimedia clips before the

client can gain access (Column 5, lines 5-7)." *See* present Office Action, page 4. Applicant disagrees that the combination of Abecassis, Day and Roy teach the claimed invention.

As noted in the previous reply, dated February 15, 2008, Roy teaches that the "multimedia bridge 114 then examines whether the request is valid and/or has proper authorization. If the multimedia request of the user device 100 is not valid and/or not authorized, the multimedia bridge 114 sends a rejection message to the user device 100" (emphasis added). *See* Roy, col. 5, lines 5-9. Applicant submits that the authorization of a request in not sufficient to teach or suggest the claimed invention. Independent claims 1, 7, 8, 14 and 16 each recite authenticating a multimedia device and not merely a request, as the Examiner alleges.

As further noted in the previous reply, dated February 15, 2008, Roy still fails to teach or suggest authenticating a multimedia device. Applicant respectfully points out that authorization and authentication are not the same. Roy discloses a multimedia bridge that "examines whether the request is valid and/or has proper authorization" (emphasis added). *See* Roy, col. 5, lines 5-9. However, independent claims 1, 7, 8, 14 and 16 each recite authenticating a multimedia device. Authenticating, as is well known in the relevant art(s), establishes whether someone is, in fact, who or what it is declared to be (e.g., after having been registered). Authorization, on the other hand, is typically how a system decides or determines what a user or device can do (e.g., being granted a requested type of access to a given resource).

In response, the Examiner states that the Applicant's arguments with respect to Abecassis, Day and Roy are not persuasive because, in order "to authorize a request, that

request must be authenticated." (internal quotations omitted). *See* present Office Action, Response to Arguments section, page 15. Applicant respectfully disagrees and provides the following analogy to help elucidate that authorization does not require authentication in all circumstances as the Examiner alleges.

Amusement parks often require passengers to be a certain, minimum height before *authorizing* passengers to board rides. Typically a sign designating the minimum, required height is used for each ride; if a potential rider is taller than the minimum requirement designated by the sign, the rider is *authorized* to ride. The amusement parks, however, do not in any respect find out who the individuals are that are attempting to ride the rides, i.e. the amusement park does not *authenticate* each rider. Consequently, *authorization* in this exemplary instance is provided without *authentication*.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant submits independent claims 1, 7, 8, 14, and 16 are patentable over the art of record. Further, claims 2-6, 21 and 23 depend from claim 1, claims 9, 10, 12 and 13 depend from claim 8, and claims 17, 18, 20 and 22 depend from claim 16. For at least the reasons provided above in regards to the independent claims, and further in view of their own respective features, dependent claims 2-6, 10, 12-13, 17, 18, and 20-23 are patentable over the combination of the applied art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18 and 20-23 be withdrawn and that the claims be passed to allowance.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,013

Date: 7/14/08

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
811463_1.DOC